

**From:** [McKenna, James \(Jim\)](#)  
**To:** [Lewis, Mark](#); [ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us](mailto:ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us); [rjw@nwnatural.com](mailto:rjw@nwnatural.com); [Chip\\_Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](mailto:Chip_Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA); [Eric\\_Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](mailto:Eric_Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA); [anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us](mailto:anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us); [exec@elltd.net](mailto:exec@elltd.net)  
**Cc:** [voster@anchoreny.com](mailto:voster@anchoreny.com)  
**Subject:** Upcoming lamprey meeting  
**Date:** 04/03/2006 03:47 PM

---

Sorry I am going to miss the upcoming lamprey meeting (I am attending a week-long conference out of state). I have not vetted the following ideas with Bob and Rick, so these are not "LWG-sanctioned.". Rather, these are just my thoughts on how the meeting might be managed to optimize the odds of productivity/success. I would suggest the following agenda:

A) what do we know about lamprey?

B) what do we need to know?

C) how do we get there?

In terms of "what do we know?", I think we should rehash what the LWG is committed to do (I.e.. We stated in the PWP that lamprey would be evaluated for both human health and eco risk, and we can summarize the data we've collected to date). We should also ask each party around the table what they know (e.g., what is the status of the PGE study?, are there other studies recently completed, ongoing, or proposed?...).

We could then move into the discussion of "what we need to know", which will include any future work already anticipated by the LWG (e.g., data gaps...).

All this will lead to "how we get there", which will be an attempt to identify the appropriate buckets (RI/FS, NRD, and "other").

I will try to call in Thursday for the first 30 minutes to assess the kick-off. Again, these are just my thoughts. I full full confidence in you all developing the goals, objectives and agenda for this meeting. Thanks, Jim.